

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejection presented in the Office Action dated October 22, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action) has been considered but is believed to be improper. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(b) rejection based upon the teachings of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0063732 by Mansikkaniemi *et al.* (hereinafter “Mansikkaniemi”) because it has not been shown that Mansikkaniemi teaches or suggests each of the claimed limitations. For example, no portion of Mansikkaniemi has been identified as teaching associating one or more calendar notes with calendar profiles of a terminal, each calendar profile defining a unique view to calendar content on the basis of the calendar notes associated with the calendar profile. More specifically, it has not been shown where Mansikkaniemi teaches or suggests a calendar profile that defines a unique view on the basis of calendar notes associated with the calendar profile as it has not been shown how the asserted shared calendar would correspond to the claimed calendar profile. Without correspondence to each of the claim limitations, the § 102(b) rejection is improper.

In order to anticipate a claim, the asserted reference must teach every element of the claim. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim; *i.e.* every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, all claim elements, and their limitations, must be found in the prior art reference to maintain the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant respectfully submits that Mansikkaniemi does not teach every element of independent Claims 1, 5, 10 and 14 in the requisite detail and therefore fails to anticipate Claims 1-14. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-9 and 11-13 depend from independent Claims 1, 5 and 10, respectively, and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Mansikkaniemi. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, these rejections are also improper for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 5 and 10. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited reference. Therefore, the rejection of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-9 and 11-13 is improper, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims 15 and 16 have also been added. These claims largely correspond to the limitations of original Claims 11 and 12; therefore, the new claims do not introduce new matter. The new claims are believed to be patentable over the asserted reference for the reasons set forth above.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (KOL.217.WUS) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 55425  
952.854.2700

Date: March 24, 2008

By: 

Erin M. Nichols  
Reg. No. 57,125